

Comment on “Time-dependent current-density functional theory for generalized open quantum systems” by J. Yuen-Zhou, C. Rodríguez-Rosario and A. Aspuru-Guzik,

Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys. **2009**, **11**, 4509

Roberto D’Agosta

*Nano-Bio Spectroscopy group and ETSF Scientific Development Centre, Dpto Física de Materiales,
Universidad del País Vasco UPV/EHU, E-20018 San Sebastián, Spain and
IKERBASQUE, Basque Foundation for Science, 48011, Bilbao, Spain*

Massimiliano Di Ventra

*Department of Physics, University of California - San Diego, La Jolla, California, 92093, USA
(Dated: August 25, 2009)*

In a recent article¹ Yuen-Zhuo *et al.* (YZ) have proposed an extension of our theorem of Stochastic Time-Dependent Current Density Functional Theory (STDCDFT).^{2,3} The main claim of this generalization is a mapping between open and closed quantum systems, namely that the dynamics of the current and particle densities of an open quantum many-body system can be uniquely determined by the time evolution of the same quantities of an effective non-interacting closed system. If this were true, there would be no need to consider the evolution of a density matrix via a master equation, but rather the dynamics of the current and particle densities could be obtained via the time evolution of the standard Schrödinger equation. From a computational point of view this would be dramatically cheaper than solving for a master equation,⁴ and would also leave open the possibility of analytical solutions, asymptotic expansions, etc. In this comment we point out some serious deficiencies in the proof of YZ’s theorem that invalidate their main results.

Let us begin with a critical examination of Theorem 1 in Ref. 1. To do this, let us recall that in the theory of open quantum systems, the equation of motion for the ensemble-averaged particle density, $n(r, t)$, is given by⁵

$$\partial_t n(r, t) = -\vec{\nabla} \cdot \vec{j}(r, t) + \mathcal{F}_B(r, t) \quad (1)$$

where $\mathcal{F}_B(r, t)$ describes the density modulation induced by the presence of the bath and $\vec{j}(r, t)$ is the ensemble-averaged current density.⁶ Eqn 1 can be obtained from the master equation for the density matrix, $\hat{\rho}$

$$\partial_t \hat{\rho}(t) = -i \left[\hat{H}(t), \hat{\rho}(t) \right] + \int_{t_0}^t dt' K(t, t') \hat{\rho}(t'). \quad (2)$$

Here, $K(t, t')$ is a memory kernel that describes the action of the bath on the system, and $\hat{H}(t)$ is the Hamiltonian of the system that evolves under the action of an external vector potential possibly time dependent (we work, as in YZ’s work in a gauge in which the scalar potential has been set to zero).

Theorem 1 in Ref. 1 then states that there is a one-to-one correspondence between a vector potential and the pair of functions given by the current and particle

densities. However, this statement cannot be correct as a simple mathematical characterization of the functional spaces connected by this mapping shows. If, as YZ seem to argue, the particle and current densities are *independent* functions, then they define a 4-dimensional functional space. This amounts to saying that $\mathcal{F}_B(r, t)$ is not completely determined by the sole knowledge of $n(r, t)$ and $\vec{j}(r, t)$. Since a general vector potential is a vector of three independent functions, Theorem 1 in YZ’s work would imply that a 4-dimensional functional space formed by the density plus the three components of the current density is locally homeomorphic to a 3-dimensional functional space spanned by the vector potential. This is obviously incorrect. A similar problem is present in the connection between the scalar potential and the current density.⁷ The solution to this inconsistency is that the continuity eqn (1) is indeed a non-linear equation in the particle and current densities from which the particle density can be obtained starting from the current density, once the bath operator and initial conditions have been fixed.^{2,3} This amounts to saying that $\mathcal{F}_B(r, t)$ is a functional of $n(r, t)$ and $\vec{j}(r, t)$, or better of $\vec{j}(r, t)$ alone, and that equation (1) admits a unique physical solution.

It is also worth pointing out that our proof of the theorem,² as well as that of the theorem of standard TDCDFT,⁸ does not require that the particle density in the auxiliary system is equal to the particle density in the original one.⁹ In those proofs one only needs to determine the n -th time derivative of all quantities, and only the $(n+1)$ -th time derivative of the vector potential. The n -th time derivative of the particle density is obtained from eqn (1) (or, in a closed system from the same equation with $\mathcal{F}_B = 0$). That equation, however, does not contain any $(n+1)$ -th time derivative. Therefore, the equation for the vector potential in the auxiliary system we use in our proof² is still a recursive relation, with a unique solution provided the initial conditions. The theorem then guarantees the one-to-one correspondence between external vector potential and ensemble-averaged current density, leaving quite open the (possibly difficult) task of obtaining the ensemble-averaged density from the current density, when the continuity equation is given by eqn (1).

Apparently, the motivation of YZ's work to extend our STDCDFT theorem appears connected to this point, namely that eqn (1) may not always be satisfied, i.e., that the contribution $\mathcal{F}_B(r, t)$ is not equal in the real and KS systems, if one keeps the bath operator fixed [see discussion after eqn (18) in their manuscript]. Besides the fact that this statement is not mathematically proven - and following the discussion of the previous paragraph, not strictly necessary - we could argue that, since in calculating the particle and current densities one fixes only a few degrees of freedom of the density matrix, two density matrices can indeed produce the same average particle and current densities (in two different systems) and satisfy eqn (1) with the same bath operator. In addition, unlike what YZ claim, we have never argued that the term $\mathcal{F}_B(r, t)$ needs to be small¹⁰ or to vanish identically. Indeed, when discussing the continuity equation (1) in our formalism (sec. II-D of Ref. 3) we have requested that it uniquely fixes the ensemble-average particle density once the average current density is given, with or without the contribution $\mathcal{F}_B(r, t)$. This is definitely true for the initial conditions, when the system and bath are (by hypothesis) uncorrelated and thus $\mathcal{F}_B(r, t_0) = 0$. In our original paper we have then separated the following discussion in two cases. On the one hand we have considered that this extra term identically vanishes at any instant of time. This happens, for example, when we consider local bath operators. In this case we do not need to go any further because the density can be obtained uniquely from the current density in the standard way. On the other hand, if the extra term $\mathcal{F}_B(r, t)$ does not vanish identically, the only physical option left is to assume that eqn (1) uniquely determines $n(r, t)$ given $\vec{j}(r, t)$, once the initial conditions and bath operator are fixed. Indeed, in our proof we construct the average density and current density in time, once the initial conditions are assigned, and show that the term $\mathcal{F}_B(r, t)$ is some functional of the current and particle densities. At this point, the (now possibly nonlinear) equation of motion (1) for the average particle density admits one and only one physical solution given the average current density, once the initial state has been assigned.¹¹

We now want to critically examine Theorem 3 in Ref. 1, where the main result of that paper is presented: YZ claim to show that it is possible to construct a unique closed non-interacting quantum system that mimics the dynamics of $n(r, t)$ and $\vec{j}(r, t)$ of the real open interacting system. We want to point out that, following YZ's reasoning, one can in fact find many (possibly infinite) closed non-interacting quantum systems that reproduce the dynamics of the exact current and particle densities. However, this is in contrast with Theorem 1, that claims that given the densities only one such system should exist. In their proof, at step 1, YZ state that the vector $\vec{C}(r, t)$ can be uniquely determined by their eqn (23)

$$\vec{C}(r, t) = -\frac{m}{en(r, t)} \int d^3r' \left(\frac{\partial n(r', t)}{\partial t} + \vec{\nabla}' \cdot \vec{j}(r', t) \right) \quad (3)$$

once a boundary condition in space that fixes an arbitrary function of time is assigned. However, the above equation is not the unique solution to eqn (22) of Ref. 1, which reads

$$\frac{\partial n(r, t)}{\partial t} = -\vec{\nabla} \cdot \vec{j}(r, t) - \vec{\nabla} \cdot \left(\frac{e\vec{C}(r, t)}{m} n(r, t) \right). \quad (4)$$

For instance, easily fulfilling the assigned boundary condition, one can add the curl of an arbitrary vector, $\vec{g}(r, t)$, to the function $\vec{C}(r, t)$ and still satisfy their eqn (22). Indeed it is easily proven that $\vec{C}'(r, t) = \vec{C}(r, t) + (\vec{\nabla} \times \vec{g}(r, t))/n(r, t)$ still satisfies eqn (22) if $\vec{C}(r, t)$ satisfies the same equation. If we now continue with the proof and use $\vec{C}'(r, t)$ we arrive at a new vector potential $\vec{A}'_{KS}(r, t)$ that gives the same $n(r, t)$ and $\vec{j}(r, t)$ as the couple $\vec{A}_{KS}(r, t)$ and $\vec{C}(r, t)$. This, however, is in contradiction with Theorem 1 that claims a one-to-one mapping between $n(r, t)$, $\vec{j}(r, t)$ and $\vec{A}_{KS}(r, t)$, when all the other operators and the boundary condition, are kept fixed.¹² This ambiguity reflects the fact that YZ are trying to mimic the effect of a scalar function - the term $\mathcal{F}_B(r, t)$ in eqn (1) - with a vector function, $\vec{C}(r, t)$, without imposing strict boundary conditions (BCs) on $\vec{C}(r, t)$.

A simple solution to the aforementioned problem may appear by setting $\vec{\nabla} \times \vec{C}(r, t) \equiv 0$. However, it is important to realize that the imposition of certain boundary conditions on the dynamics of these quantities has a direct impact on the uniqueness of the results. For example, assuming that $\vec{C}(r, t)$ reaches a certain uniform limit when $|r| \rightarrow \infty$, might be inconsistent with the bath operator acting on the true many-body system. Indeed, certain bath operators can be strongly non-local in space, effectively transferring charge from one region of space to another, with the two arbitrarily far from each other. Therefore, the BCs on $\vec{\nabla} \times \vec{C}(r, t)$ have not a clear physical origin or relation to any physical observable. Fixing their value to obtain one solution appears utterly arbitrary. Notice that a similar problem appears also in the case of the standard theorem of TDDFT (see for example Ref. 13) where the additional boundary condition $n(r)\vec{\nabla}\Delta V(r, t) \rightarrow 0$ when $|r| \rightarrow \infty$ is added to the proof. However, in this case, while in principle this condition is arbitrary and one may choose another condition, this choice is motivated by physical arguments that are valid for a wide range of systems. The same considerations instead do not apply to all the components of the vector $\vec{C}(r, t)$. Therefore, the proof of the theorem as it is formulated in Ref. 1 cannot hold for general bath operators.

Finally, we want to comment on a fundamental but important issue. YZ's initial assumption for their theorem is a closed equation of motion for the density matrix. As we have discussed at length in our previous publications,^{2,3} this is not a solid starting point for a formulation of DFT for open quantum systems. This is due to both the possible loss of positivity of the density matrix if an equation of motion of such quantity is employed

with the Hamiltonian and/or bath operator(s) dependent on time,¹⁴ and the fact that the KS Hamiltonian does depend on internal degrees of freedom. Starting from the master equation formulation of the same problem, one needs to exclude from the outset the possibility that the Hamiltonian of any auxiliary system with different interaction potential (and hence the KS Hamiltonian) depends on the internal degrees of freedom. Otherwise, for such a system no closed density-matrix equation can be

obtained. In other words, one needs to start from an hypothesis that constitutes part of the final thesis. It is only when one starts from a stochastic Schrödinger equation for the *state vector* that one can prove that the *exact* KS Hamiltonian depends only on the average current density.

RD acknowledges the hospitality of Imperial College London where part of this work has been completed. MD acknowledges financial support from the Department of Energy grant DE-FG02-05ER46204.

-
- ¹ J. Yuen-Zhou, C. Rodríguez-Rosario and A. Aspuru-Guzik, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, 2009, **11**, 4509.
- ² M. Di Ventra and R. D'Agosta, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 2007, **98**, 226403.
- ³ R. D'Agosta and M. Di Ventra, *Phys. Rev. B*, 2008, **78**, 165105.
- ⁴ Y. V. Pershin, Y. Dubi and M. Di Ventra, *Phys. Rev. B*, 2008, **78**, 054302.
- ⁵ W. R. Frensley, *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, 1990, **62**, 745.
- ⁶ In this theory we do not allow for the system to exchange particles with the environment.
- ⁷ R. D'Agosta and G. Vignale, *Phys. Rev. B*, 2005, **71**, 245103.
- ⁸ G. Vignale, *Phys. Rev. B*, 2004, **70**, 201102(R).
- ⁹ Indeed, in the standard TD-CDFD proof one uses the standard continuity equation to infer the equality between the two densities. In our proof, we postulated it from the uniqueness of the solution of the non-linear continuity eqn (1), with $\mathcal{F}_B(r, t)$ a functional of the current density.
- ¹⁰ However, in our theory, this term is proportional to the modulus square of the coupling constant between the bath and the system, which by assumption is small.¹⁵ In the formalism proposed by Zwanzig,¹⁶ that YZ seem to follow, the degrees of freedom that are integrated out are not in equilibrium and do not describe a thermal bath.
- ¹¹ Here, we cannot exclude the existence of pathological, non-physical cases for which eqn (1) admits more than one solution for a given average current and initial condition.
- ¹² The effective vector potential entering in the KS Hamiltonian is $\vec{A}_{KS} + \vec{C}$. Furthermore, we do expect that $\vec{A}_{KS} + \vec{C} \neq \vec{A}'_{KS} + \vec{C}'$. Thus we have two KS systems producing the same current and particle densities in contrast with YZ's Theorem 1.
- ¹³ R. van Leeuwen, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 1999, **82**, 3863.
- ¹⁴ G. W. Ford and R. F. O'Connell, *Ann. Phys.*, 2005, **319**, 348.
- ¹⁵ P. Gaspard and M. Nagaoka, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 1999, **111**, 5676.
- ¹⁶ R. Zwanzig, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 1960, **33**, 1338.